

Defeating ISIS

All sane forces internationally agree that the Islamic State (IS/ISIS) barbarians, who are running rampant in Southwest Asia, must be defeated. In fact, as Lyndon LaRouche emphasized recently, they should never have come into existence.

But, from all indications, when Barack Obama addresses the nation tonight (Sept. 10), he will not present a plan to eliminate the barbarians. Rather, he will declare that he—without the required Constitutional approval of Congress—will undertake what British Prime Minister David Cameron (and the Queen’s favorite Tony Blair) call a “generational war”—perpetual warfare with no peace strategy in mind, or in sight. Secretary of State Kerry has already estimated it will take three years, at least to defeat ISIS.

Such a “strategy” violates one of the very foundations for a just war: that it be undertaken with a clear set of objectives for ending the conflict through the establishment of a peace based on justice for all, the winners and the vanquished. That concept was codified most clearly in the 1648 Treaty of Westphalia, which ended the hideous barbarism of the Thirty Years War, and ushered in the era of sovereign nation-states collaborating with one another, for mutual benefit and progress.

The need to have a strategy for *ending* the war, before launching it, has also been a consistent refrain of U.S. Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Martin Dempsey. Dempsey was successful in the case of Obama’s previous plans to bomb Syria—but in the current circumstance, it’s not clear that he will prevail.

The Obama-British war against ISIS directly violates this concept. It is an imperial strategy aimed at breaking up nation-states, and leading to permanent warfare, especially between Shi’as and

Sunnis in the Islamic world. The proof of the pudding is the fact that the very governments leading the war against it, are responsible for the creation of ISIS, particularly through the British Monarchy’s cat’s paw, the Saudi Kingdom.

Why, for example, will the Obama and Cameron governments not work directly with Syrian president Assad and the Iranian Republic in crushing ISIS? Because the current Anglo-American objective is not to establish a “peace order,” but to carry out regime change in the region—regime change that will lawfully lead to escalating sectarian warfare.

And why will the Obama Administration, along with its de facto Cheneyac allies in the Republican Party, not crack down on the Saudi funders of these murderous jihadis? True, the Saudi rulers are currently *very* afraid that ISIS and its ilk will turn against them, and made one promise after another to crush them. As in the case of al-Qaeda, the Saudis and the British created these forces to be used against *other* nations; it’s only when they boomerang, that they object.

We have a litmus test before us on this question—the demand for the release of the 28 pages of the Congressional Inquiry on 9/11, which deal with the funding of the 2001 attacks. Pressure is building, and the consequences would be to blow wide open the truth that the Saudis, and their British godfathers, are behind the terror, and expose the criminality of the Obama and Bush officials who have protected them.

There’s no way to win a war against Islamic (or any other kind of) terrorists, without telling the truth, adhering to the principles of a just war, and following the U.S. Constitution. Obama and the Congress must be held to that standard, or we’ll just go deeper into the depths of Hell.